

REMARKS

The office action of December 7, 2010 and the Advisory Action of March 25, 2011, have been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 4, 6-11, 13-17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the patent application of Miller et al.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miller et al. in view of the patent application of Miller.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miller et al. in view of the patent to Milborn.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has amended claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, applicant has discussed the

references at length in previous amendments and incorporates those comments herein by reference. The following additional arguments are presented.

The Examiner argues that the adhesive composition 24 of Miller et al. anticipates the bordering recited in claim 1 of the present application. To begin with, the composition 24 does not encircle the building component. Instead the composition is only provided on one or both of the opposing edges of the panel 10. There is no disclosure that the composition 24 encircles the entire panel. To more clearly bring out this distinction, applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the bordering encircles the entire perimeter of the building component.

Additionally, Miller et al. does not disclose a bordering that forms a visible filling at the visible upper surface of joints between coating elements of the building component and other building components connected to the building component. In Miller et al. the adhesive composition 24 is not visible when the panel 10 is connected to another panel 10, as is required by the present invention. To better bring out this distinction, applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the bordering forms a visible filling at the visible upper surface of joints between coating

elements of connected building components.

Thus, Miller et al. do not disclose the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations, as well as those presented in previous amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-11, 13-17 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Miller and Milborn references have also been considered. Applicant submits that neither of these references adds anything to the teachings of Fowler so as to suggest the presently claimed invention as discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.


Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and

Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI LLP

By


Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
(212) 661-8000

Dated: April 7, 2011

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by EFS-web to the Commissioner for Patents on April 7, 2011.

By:


Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: April 7, 2011